

BAPTIST DISHONESTY.

MISQUOTATIONS AND OTHER GROSS MISREPRESENTATIONS

IN THE

RECENT PAMPHLET ON BAPTISM

OF THE BAPTIST MINISTER,

REV. A. A. CAMERON,
OF OTTAWA,

EXPOSED

BY THE REV. J. BETHUNE, PRESBYTERIAN MINISTER, CHESLEY, ONT.,
AUTHOR OF "BAPTIST MISREPRESENTATIONS."

"He that is first in his own cause seemeth just; but his
neighbour cometh and searcheth him."—Prov., xviii, 17.

PUBLISHED BY REQUEST.

OTTAWA:

J. DURIE & SON, BOOKSELLERS.

PRICE 10 CENTS.

62

BAPTIST DISHONESTY.

MISQUOTATIONS AND OTHER GROSS MISREPRESENTATIONS

IN THE

RECENT PAMPHLET ON BAPTISM

OF THE BAPTIST MINISTER,

REV. A. A. CAMERON,

OF OTTAWA,

EXPOSED

BY THE REV. J. BETHUNE, PRESBYTERIAN MINISTER, CHESLEY, ONT.,

AUTHOR OF "BAPTIST MISREPRESENTATIONS."

"He that is first in his own cause seemeth just; but his
neighbour cometh and searcheth him."—Prov., xviii, 17.

PUBLISHED BY REQUEST.

OTTAWA:

J. DURIE & SON, BOOKSELLERS.

BV813

B43

INTRODUCTION.

Having recently received a copy of the small but bold Baptist manifesto specified in the title page, and lately issued to the infant Baptist community of Ottawa, I soon afterwards found an effort made privately to introduce it among some of my own congregation here—full 400 miles distant from the place of publication. It was published, says the author in his preface, “by special request,” and was evidently prepared carefully for its purpose, containing as much varied matter, crowded in, as its small space of 24 pages could admit of. The arts of proselytism for which the Close Communionist section, to which Rev. Mr. Cameron belongs, is so much distinguished, are conspicuous throughout in an abundance of assertions without attempts at proof, together with an array of professed quotations from infant Baptist writers; with reference to the latter I will give some specimens of the *gross dishonesty* practised by Mr. Cameron in this pamphlet. He was well aware that *very few* of his readers would have access to the infant Baptist books from which he proposes to quote, to ascertain if he did so correctly. Besides, he avoids specifying the particular volumes and sections of them whence the statements would be found. In this way he may hope the more to avoid detection, and, not without success, mislead. He thus concludes his preface :

“A careful perusal of the quotations given will open the eyes of many on this matter. All is submitted in the interests of pure evangelical truth.”

After such a statement who could for a moment doubt his honesty ! and what *Baptist* would ? It was intended to produce confidence in his integrity, and likely would with most, whatever they might think of the statements quoted. But this should and will make his dishonesty all the more culpable to those who see it exposed.

Before entering on his pamphlet it will be of service to the unacquainted reader to explain a little the distinctive features of

THE CLOSE COMMUNIONIST THEORY.

They contend that none are *baptized at all* in the sense of the Scripture ordinance who in infancy have been dipped in water or sprinkled with it in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost ; or who, after they have become believers, have had the water poured or sprinkled on them and were not dipped. This is the question that exercises that body so much. Then, on the position that the baptism of water is the divinely appointed means of admission into the membership of the visible Church of Christ, they hold that none of all the infant Baptists of past ages and the present, were and are members of

or within his Church at all! since according to them they were not baptized. One would think that such a conclusion of itself might convince themselves that their theory of baptism is at variance with Scripture doctrine and fact. But no, they hold to it as tenaciously as the Pharisees maintained to the last, notwithstanding the evidence to the contrary, that Jesus was not the true Scriptural Messiah. It therefore further follows in their theory that of all professing and truly godly Christians, none have ever been or are members of the Christian church but Baptists alone. They only have ever been and are Christ's kingdom on earth! The Church—all infant Baptists were and are members of, and connected with—was not and is not His. Hence on this ground they don't, and, by their constitution, will not allow any infant Baptists, however eminent in faith and piety, to communicate with them at all in the Lord's supper, or to partake of any privileges of the membership, as according to them, they are outside of the church, not admitted within, not entitled to the children's bread and privileges. Of the illustrious infant Baptist Christians at the great Reformation, and before and since, who in living faith preached the true scripture evangel with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven, to the pulling down of Satan's strongholds and the salvation of myriads, with the vast multitudes of their brethren of every land and age who suffered the loss of all things, and loved not their lives unto death for the faith and testimony of Jesus, and all of like spirit in the world to-day—not one of all of them would Close Communionists suffer to partake of the material bread, and drink the cup emblematical of their faith in and love for their crucified and risen Saviour, of which also He says to *all* his disciples, 'Take, eat; drink ye *all* of it.' We are not dependent, however, on their permission or consent. And at our own communion table has not the Lord manifested himself to his people, and does he not in our breaking of bread, as also in our other ordinances and services? If the Lord and Master sup with us and we with him there, who are they who say, No; in Christ's name we cannot allow you to sit at his table? And who are those they receive rather? The godly Bunyan, (who with his congregation, as he informs us, were constantly assailed by the Close Communionists of his day) in his treatise 'Differences in Judgment, No Bar to Communion,' told them what we know is equally true still.

"You exclude," he says, "the most godly from your Communion, when every novice in religion shall be received into your bosom, and be of esteem with you, because he hath—and from what grounds God knows—submitted to water baptism."

Nay, so far does their zeal carry them on this matter of water that they exclude and practically excommunicate even the *Open* Communionists, who hold their own views of the mode and subjects of the ordinance, simply because they don't regard the question of such vital importance as to refuse to unite in communion at the supper with their infant Baptist brethren and acknowledge them as in the Church. Mr. Spurgeon, for example, the credit of whose name as a Baptist minister and successful laborer in the gospel they are very willing to take, yet him they would not permit to sit with them there, &c.

The Lord Jesus, by the apostle directs *His* Church, "Him that is weak in the faith *RECEIVE* ye, but not to doubtful disputations—To his own master

he standeth or falleth. Yea, he shall be holden up: for God is able to make him stand—For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink; [neither is it water] but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost."

In a sermon of the Rev. Mr. Cameron, of Ottawa, published in the *Canadian Baptist* (the leading Close Communionist weekly paper of the Province), of 10th August last—now before me—I find the following:

"As Baptists we lay special claim to being the *true* Catholic and Apostolic Church." "A true appreciation of our claims to be *the* true Apostolic Church of Christ," etc.

The other Protestant denominations claim to be each only branches or portions of the Apostolic Church—none of them assuming to be itself "*the* Church." Again, in the "*Globe*" and "*Mail*" of 17th Oct. last,—now before me,—in their reports of the recent Regular Baptist (Close Communionist) Convention in Toronto, the same Mr. Cameron is stated to have said that

"The Baptists were the *ONLY* evangelical body in Christendom."

That is, no other body is. The reason he gave was

"Because they preserved the *symbols* as delivered by Christ in their entirety."

Now, as their doctrine and mode of administration of the *symbol* of the Lord's Supper are the same as ours, his reference was to their theory of Baptism, the only other symbol. So the Scriptural soundness in the vital soul-saving doctrines of the gospel or evangel, and the true evangelic faith, piety, and fruitfulness of other bodies go for nothing as entitling them to be called evangelical. But if not that, what then are they? He also

"Maintained that the *special* features of the *Baptist* Church were the *essential* characteristics of the *Apostolic* Church."

No creature, for example, can be really a man which has not *all* the "*essential* characteristics" of man; hence to assume the "*special* features" of the Baptist Church,—that is, those in which it differs from others,—to be "*the essential characteristics of the Apostolic Church*," means that the other denominations are not really of the Church of Christ at all. He is also reported to have said that,

"As long as they (the Baptists) preserved those symbols (Baptism and the Lord's Supper), there was *no danger* of infidelity creeping in among them;" that "Baptists had remained the same in their belief and practice, while Paedobaptists were continually changing."

The audacity of these assertions in face of the very unsound doctrines and practices which have characterized the past history of Baptist churches, is only equalled by the spirit ruling the Convention which could listen silently without a word of expostulation. And what about the Baptist denominations different from Mr. C's. own, of the present day,—the Disciples or Campbellites, the Six Principle, the Seventh Day, the Antimission, the Church of God, the Free-Will Baptist, the Mennonites, Tunkers, Plymouth-brethren, &c. &c.,—with all their serious differences in doctrine and practice? Moreover, it is well known there is in the United States a large body of Unitarian *Baptists*, who maintain that Christ is not God, but only a mere man; that he did not bear the curse of the law in the stead of sinners, making atonement for us, but died only as the martyrs have done. Untruthful as those statements are, they attach, however, a wonderful virtue to the

baptism of water. Well, to add another remark, the Apostles, they say baptized as they do. Surely then the symbols would be as preservative of the Church's uniformity of faith and practice in their days. Yet from Paul we learn of very vital errors in the churches of Corinth, Galatia, Ephesus, Philippi, Colosse, &c.; from Peter and Jude of the entrance of many teachers of "damnable heresies" and practices; also from John's epistles; and in Revelation, of very serious departures in some of the seven churches of Asia.

I will conclude this introduction with a quotation from a small book before me, issued and therefore accredited by the Baptist Publication Society, Philadelphia, and entitled "The Sufficiency of Water for Baptizing at Jerusalem, &c., by the Rev. Geo. W. Samson." He remarks (p. 14):

'In devout harmony of soul with the ancient Psalmist, loving as he did the truth and honor of God, seeing that Jerusalem's ancient "towers" and "bulwarks" and "palaces" are laid low, take we up the *spirit* of his language: "Walk about Zion and go round about her. See the *pools*, mark ye well her fountains, consider her *flowing waters*, that ye may tell it to the generation following."

This concludes his statement. The words *italicised* are so by him. The words of the psalm referred to (xlviii. 13) on Zion are—"Tell the towers thereof. Mark ye well her bulwarks; consider her palaces, that ye may tell," etc. And the verse that follows is, "For this God is our God for ever and ever: He will be our guide even unto death." Also (ver. 3, 8), "God is known in her palaces for a *refuge*. God will establish it for ever." So the towers and bulwarks really referred to "in the spirit" are God himself alone. But the Baptist authority already noticed, directs its readers to understand by them (not God, but) *pools, fountains* and *flowing waters*, for baptism; in doing which they would be "in devout harmony with the psalmist," and with "the truth and honor of God?" In other words, that the Holy Spirit intended as "the *spirit* of the psalmist's language" that the conveniences for immersion are Zion's bulwarks and towers! I wonder if our Saviour meant them when he said to Peter, "And on this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Romanists say "this rock" was Peter and their Popes, We Protestants reply it was that, that Peter had just before confessed—"Christ the Son of the living God," and neither popes nor baptism of water, which is as delusive a foundation as the trust of the Pharisees in their rites and ceremonies. He only is the stronghold of Zion, not dipping in water nor sprinkling, and the baptism not of water but of the Holy Spirit, is that by which He unites us to; builds us on, and ever keeps us safely in Him.

We will now enter on the merits of Mr. Cameron's pamphlet referred to in our title page: Let us briefly consider

SOME SPECIMENS OF ITS STYLE.

I. In the "only evangelical body in Christendom" one would expect a large measure of grace, not elsewhere to be found, and its ministers in particular, to be examples of sobriety of speech, fairness and Christian courtesy, and to those outside of 'the' church who will "in meekness instruct those

hat oppose themselves." One of our Saviour's tests of character is—"By their fruits ye shall know them." "Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh."

After characterizing the arguments for infant baptism from the household baptisms of Scripture as founded on "mere supposition" (p. 5), Mr. Cameron adds,

"No court on earth, *except a pedo-baptist church*, would accept of such evidence."

That is (he would like his readers to believe that) all pedo-baptist churches have been and are either lower in intellect than *any* worldly court on earth, or in the quality of honesty! And as none will suppose the former, the latter is to be inferred. Again (p. 8),

"The household argument has not even the shadow of the shade of the ghost of a foundation."

And (p. 12),

"Now what does baptism do for the child? Wanted! a star-theologian, who will enlighten evangelical pedo-baptists on this point!"

Query,—Did Paul mean this style by his evangelical direction, "Let your speech be always with grace, seasoned with salt, that ye may know how ye ought to answer every man?" But aside from the coarse impertinence of the questioner, *any* evangelical pedo-baptist may answer his question. As well might he ask, What does prayer do for a child? Is that useless because the infant may not understand or be aware of it?

Again (p. 21), on sufficiency of water for immersion, he exclaims,—

"Will our pedo-friends, *with all their pretensions to literary lore*, ignore the fact, that Jerusalem has from time immemorial been known as the City of Baths and Fountains? The mere schoolboy need not be told of some fountains in Jerusalem (see John v. 1). Have our pedo-baptist friends forgotten all about the Pool of Siloam, &c.

Of these baths and fountains I will yet speak; but how are these artful and vile insinuations (substitutes for proof), laden with studied show of contempt, with which he hopes to inspire some of his readers! And if everything he asserts is true, we in our shocking practice of *sprinkling* the water have (p. 23),—

"flapping about our garments, some of the very first rags that Babylon wore."

Such are a few specimens of his mode of addressing pedo-baptists, in a pamphlet published by "special request." Let me add, for a variety, a specimen of the style to the Baptists; in which you may expect still less restraint. In the *Canadian Baptist* of 28th Oct. 1875, appeared an article signed "By Ottawa," and understood to be by Mr. Cameron. Being considered worthy of the place, the Editor placed it (!) under his section permanently headed "THE BAPTIST PULPIT." A few weeks before, at a certain public meeting, Mr. (now Dr.) Robb, one of the most estimable ministers of our Presbyterian church, had objected to a suggestion of one who had called in question the Scripturality of *the doctrine of everlasting punishment*, that our Confession should be altered to make that, in it, an undecided doctrine. Referring to this the "Ottawa" critic observed,—

"It is no wonder that the Rev. Mr. Robb, the champion of the Confession, stood up with holy wrath haloing his natural dignity."

I rather fear it will be even offensive to real evangelical taste to ask, Is this like Paul, Peter, Christ? It looks much more like an infidel's sneer! He continued,—

"Is not the Presbyterian Church of Canada *built on* the same Confession of faith?" "if it can be proven after all that this great wealthy and influential church be *not built upon* the foundation of Christ and his apostles."

Need I tell my readers that it builds and is built on no other than Christ Jesus and Him crucified, as the only foundation of salvation? Again he told his Baptist readers,—

"The Confession is now looked upon even as an INFALLIBLE CODE of ethics and religion."

That is, Presbyterians regard the Westminster Assembly and Confession fully inspired and infallible, as the poor deluded Romanists do the Pope? He thus concludes,—

"So long as the church and her standards are elevated *above the Bible*, Infant baptism has the promise of a long reign. But if the sharp, gleaming, two-edged sword of the Spirit is what is to try the doctrines and practices of the church, then it is doomed to perish. The axe which is before long to be at the root of this ancient but *rotten tree*, is already sharpening on the grindstone of public opinion, and soon it shall fall *a huge mass of hollow rottenness!*"

All this, be it remembered, with its false and odious calumny, is given to its Baptist readers as "*The Baptist Pulpit*," in the belief no doubt from their training that it would be acceptable to their taste, and would confirm them in it the more, and elevate the writer in their esteem—as, at least, a zealous Baptist. But there is in all this, besides other remarkable things, a striking inconsistency in their own conduct, of which Mr. C. is well aware. I have a copy in hand of the Church Property Title Deeds of each of the congregations of his denomination (I wish I could transcribe it here, but it is too long); in which is engrossed a considerable *list of specified doctrines, observances, and regulations*, which they bind themselves to "hold and maintain," as the conditions of their tenure and possession of their church buildings, &c.; that is to say a *Confession of Faith* to which they bind themselves, and the ownership of their church property to the Regular Baptist (Close Communionist) denomination. All this is quietly subscribed to, and secured to their denomination by compact, with the strength of the Canadian Civil government to enforce the same, if necessary. I have also on hand, purchased from the Baptist Book Room, Toronto, two present day *Baptist Confessions of Faith*, and a third, entitled "The Baptist Confession of Faith, prepared by upwards of 100 Baptist ministers in General Assembly in London, in 1689;"—which is a copy throughout, nearly word for word, of our Westminster Confession, except on Baptism, and a very few other differences; with a commendatory preface by Mr. Spurgeon. Besides, I can show from Baptist and other authorities quite a number of other Baptist Confessions, drawn up, promulgated, and used in their history in Britain and America, &c. And yet Mr. Cameron and his brethren rail against us for using a Confession of Faith of what we believe to be the doctrines of Scripture!

II. We will now consider the tactics in

QUOTATIONS FROM INFANT BAPTISTS.

This is a favorite resort of Baptists. Romish writers are also distinguished by a particular fondness for extracting sentences they detach with

Jesuitical art from the early fathers and Protestant books, to confirm Rome's interpretations of certain scriptures and her tenets in general; as we know they are greatly addicted, though the deluded Romanists trust them, to misrepresentations—by omission of clauses, interpolations of their own, complete fabrications, and other methods. And while it necessarily takes much more space and trouble to demonstrate their misrepresentations than for them to make them, as the body can be much more speedily mutilated than healed,—many who read, and in their simplicity believe the misrepresentations, never see their exposure. They are deceived and know it not! I regret to have too truly to say that Baptist writers are also addicted to misrepresentations of the statements of infant Baptists, &c. A book recently published by me on “Baptist Misrepresentations,” exhibits a large number of them, taken from books issued by the Baptist Church Publication Societies, and compared with the statements of the authors professedly quoted. I will now show you some specimens from the pen of Mr. Cameron! His first quotation (p. 6) I have not the means at hand of verifying, but have of his next, to which I solicit your attention. He remarks (p. 7):

“The promise to you and your children, (Acts ii, 39), is made to do duty in the paedobaptist cause. Dr. Doddridge remarks, “The word in the original, *tekna*, rendered *children*, signifies *posterity*; and does not necessarily imply infancy.”

(1) By the above the reader would suppose that in Dr. Doddridge's opinion, that passage, Acts ii, 39, does not refer to infants. (2) Mr. C. does not indicate in which of Doddridge's many volumes that “remark” quoted as his, is to be found. (3) I have his works, and find that passage of the Acts referred to by him (Vol. v, Lect. cciii), as a *proof of infant baptism*. (4) After careful examination, I have to say he nowhere makes that “remark” above ascribed to him. (5) I have found it elsewhere accidentally, in looking over for another purpose “Pengilly's Scripture Guide to Baptism,” issued by the Baptist Publication Society; but it is entirely *Pengilly's own*. On that passage of the Acts he gives three arguments of his own, which he marks 1, 2, 3. His second is the statement in question; as follows:

Pengilly's argument, (p. 29) :—
“2. The word in the original, *tekna*, rendered *children*, signifies *posterity*; and does not necessarily imply infancy.”

Mr. Cameron's strategy:—“Dr. Doddridge remarks, ‘The word in the original, *tekna*, rendered *children*, signifies *posterity*; and does not necessarily imply infancy.’”

The reader will observe these to be exactly identical in the terms, and even in the punctuation and italics! In this way, the name of the eminent infant Baptist is, to use Mr. C's vulgar expression, “made to do duty” in the *Anabaptist* cause; of which he had also said in his preface:—

“A careful perusal of the quotations given will open the eyes of many on this matter. All is submitted in the interests of pure evangelical truth.”

By “a careful perusal” he did not mean an examination and comparison of them with the originals, and hence was “careful” not to specify the volumes and places from which they are taken; the dangers of which will also further appear.

2. He gives a list of quotations (p. 9, 10). At the beginning is one as from

REV. DR. WM. CUNNINGHAM, *Principal of the New College, Edinburgh*”

This is all he states of the place; though there are *several* large works by that author. I happen to have them all, and after a search of several hours, found the passage. Dr. Cunningham is showing in opposition to Rome's doctrine on the sacraments, of spiritual virtue in themselves, that the Presbyterian doctrine undoubtedly is, that they (like other means of grace) are means of spiritual benefit only in the exercise of faith. The statement in question is in his work, "The Reformers and The Theology of the Reformation," Essay v. p. 249. I will place it and Mr. C's. together:

Cunningham's own words:—"It is impossible to deny that the general description which the 'Shorter Catechism' gives of a sacrament teaches, by plain implication, that the sacraments, so far as regards adults, are intended only for believers; while no Protestants," &c.

Mr. Cameron's quotation:—"It is impossible to deny that the general description which the 'Shorter Catechism' gives of a sacrament teaches, by a plain implication, that the sacraments are intended *only for believers*, while no Protestants," &c.

You observe that those words in the heart of Dr. Cunningham's own statement, which I have put in small capitals, *are entirely omitted* in Mr. Cameron's quotation! Baptism is one of the two sacraments, and infants being incapable of faith, as such are not believers. To say that "the sacraments are intended *only for believers*," would therefore mean that baptism is intended not for infants,—what Mr. Cameron seeks to make his readers believe; and not to lose his aim he puts the words, "*only for believers*," in *italics*. Now, why did he leave out "so far as regards adults"? The reader will discern. These words confine the *statement* to adults.

By a Jesuitical omission of the qualifying clause, EQUIVALENT TO THE CRIME OF FORGERY, Mr. C. makes it appear to apply to infants also! And "All *this*," too, "is submitted in the interests of pure evangelical truth!" We cannot fail to be reminded by "all this" of the similar methods of that other church which, in like terms and by like means, claims to be "the true Catholic Apostolic Church," and "the only evangelical body in Christendom!"

Very few of his readers, especially of Baptists, will ever find out this misquotation, &c., for themselves, or see its exposure. But having now been set in motion by him, it will no doubt be repeated in and from books of theirs for generations. From these instances given, LEARN OTHERS. Unscrupulousness, you see, is not wanting, in that zeal which compasses sea and land to make proselytes.

3. Mr. C. gives (~ 104) the following as from BAXTER, the eminent Presbyterian of the 17th century:

"I conclude that all examples of baptism in Scripture do mention only the administration of it, to the professors of saving faith" (*Disput of Right to Sacram.*)"

The next quotation is from *Boston*, of similar terms, from whom is another similar in the preceding page, stated to be also from his "*Disputation of Right to Sacrament.*" Observe these titles of their works. These are instances of another mode of misrepresentation—giving extracts without their connection. Scripture itself can easily be abused in this way. And bear in mind that Baxter and Boston acknowledged no rule of faith and practice but the Scriptures, *advocated* and *administered* infant baptism, and by sprinkling, ever till their death, and were eminently godly men.

The direction (Matth. 18; 19, 20) "Go ye, therefore, and teach (in the

original, literally, 'make disciples of,) all nations, baptising them; teaching them to observe all things' &c.,—the 'Broad church' party of Britain contended in their day, (and still do,) that our Lord meant by this that disciples were to be made of the unbelieving nations, *first of all*, by baptising them, and, thereafter, were to be taught the gospel. They thence maintained that all the subjects of the "nations" had a divine "right" to the sacrament of admission into the church, no matter how erroneous their beliefs and unworthy their character, to begin with. Baxter, Boston, and others, "disputed" this alleged "right to the sacrament," and contended as in our Catechism—which was theirs—that "baptism is not to be administered to any that are out of the visible church *till they profess faith in Christ and obedience to him*" as their Lord and Saviour according to the true faith of the gospel. The question was not one of infants at all, but of adults,—men and women. Baptist writers, however, quote detached portions from them, that their readers, who think, and know nothing at all of it, may take the isolated words as really used in the widest signification they can bear, considered by themselves,—their connection being untold and unseen!

Baptists, for example, generally hold that *all* dying in infancy *are saved*, yet being incapable of faith, were not believers. While of adults they teach faith as necessary to *their* salvation. Of these it is customary by them (and us), without specifying at the same time that infants are not meant, often to make such statements as these,—"None but believers will be saved." "All dying in unbelief are lost for ever." (Scripture does the same.) Now suppose that those who hold that *no infants*, dying as such, *can be saved*, because incapable of faith, were systematically to quote such statements to their readers and hearers as proof that the Baptists (and we) plainly admit their doctrine to be right. Or if the Universalists, of whom there are very many in the United States, who teach that all will be saved, whether they die infidels, idolaters or believers, were, in order to prejudice their people and others, to assert that we both teach that even all deceased infants without exception are lost, and to quote the above statements and similar in proof. Would the Baptists regard this in either case as truth and fairness? I trow not. They would reply justly, and probably fiercely. "We were referring only to adults, not to infants, whose case is quite different in Scripture. Give the connection and our statements specifically on infants." Whether Universalists and the others act thus I know not. But the Baptists are distinguished for this as one of their modes of misrepresentation of us. Their compilers know all about it, (not the people,) yet never mind, but quote away, to be requoted by others again, and they get and give them all "in the interests of pure evangelical truth!"

(4) On Baxter again let me give you a glaring specimen by Dr. Cramp, Professor of Acadia (Baptist) College, Nova Scotia. In his "Catechism," issued by the Baptist Publication Society, Philadelphia, (now before me,) he gives as from him (in relation to Rom. vi. 4,) in favour of immersion, a quotation I will place with another he gives as from him in his "Baptist History," (also before me,) in which (p. 269) he justly calls him "the great Richard Baxter":—

"RICHARD BAXTER, *Presbyterian* (says)—'In our baptism we are dipped under the water, as signifying our covenant profession, that as he was buried for sin, so we are dead and buried to sin.'" Cramp's Catechism on Baptism (p. 43). Dated in Preface, "Acadia College, 1865."

"There was a wonderful outcry *against* immersion. Take a specimen or two from Baxter:—'That which is a plain breach of the sixth commandment. *Thou shalt not kill*, is no ordinance of God, but a most heinous sin. But the ordinary practice of baptising over head, and in cold water, as necessary, is a plain breach of the sixth commandment: therefore it is no ordinance of God, but a heinous sin. In a word, it is good for nothing but to despatch men out of the world that are burdensome, and to ranken church yards,'" &c. Cramp's Baptist History, Edition, 1875, p. 275.

These are given as from the same Baxter in different books by the same Baptist writer and College Professor! Their contradictoriness is apparent. And of that so strongly favouring immersion, Cramp *does not say a word as to where* in all the *many* works of Baxter it may be seen; which of course prevents examination and discovery. While in the other quotation, Cramp being the witness, he describes immersion, in the circumstances practised, as a plain breach of the sixth commandment, no ordinance of God, a heinous sin.' Again if a Baptist should say, "In *our* baptism *we* are dipped under the water," he would be understood to mean himself and his denomination. But we know Baxter and his Presbyterian brethren neither baptised nor were baptised in that mode, but by sprinkling.

In the United States, however, and here, &c., are many Baptists and others whose own knowledge is very limited. I have shown Mr. Cameron's attachment of Doddridge's name and weight to a statement of which the *Baptist* Pengilly was the real author. Cramp appears here to have adopted the same unevangelical method with the weighty name of Baxter, (and how many others!) or invented the quotation for the occasion. Few of his readers would suspect that, or see an exposure. Mr. C. remarks (p. 8).

"The following evidence from Presbyterian and other divines will doubtless startle many in Ottawa."

As many of them and others as see the true character of that evidence, as we have now demonstrated it, will "startle" at it, we have no doubt, and at him and his brethren, with other feelings than satisfaction with Anabaptist morality.

As I must confine myself in space, to exceed as little as possible the length of Mr. C's pamphlet, similar exposures of several others of his quotations I reluctantly must pass over. But, as mentioned before, should the interested reader find my book on "Baptist Misrepresentations," he will see there a considerable exhibition as bad as the foregoing, from the Baptist works of Cramp, Pengilly, Robinson, Broadbas, Booth, in relation to Baxter, Wesley, Clarke, Matthew Henry, Doddridge, Dwight, &c., &c., &c., of frauds I could not think possible till I found them with my own eyes!

III. We will now consider Mr. C's arguments: abundant disproof of which and proof of infant baptism—subject and mode—those who desire will find in such small works as Miller and Witherow on baptism, price, 20 cents or so.

1. His first argument against the baptism of infants is (p. 4) an assumption (without an attempt to prove) that John's baptism was identical in all particulars with that of the church of the New Dispensation. (1) Sufficient proof of the contrary is Paul's baptising over again those baptised by John (Acts 19: 3-5). So obvious is this from that passage that even Dr. Carson (Baptist), for their insisting on its sameness, quietly but severely censured his brethren thus:

"John's baptism did not serve for Christ's baptism. Human wisdom (of Baptists) will correct the Scriptures here, and because it cannot see why John's baptism will not serve for Christ's, the words *have been tortured* to make them say that they were baptised into Christ by being baptised by John." (On baptism, p. 177).

They torture them still, as then, notwithstanding. 2. He next assumes Jesus' baptism by John to be the pattern for *all* now. But (1) the foregoing objection to this continues here. (2) Like John's disciples, Jesus and his, still observed the passover, afterwards, and the other rites of the Mosaic dispensation, till his death. Not till then was the veil of the temple rent in twain, the Old Dispensation abolished, and the New begun. (3). If Christ's example as to his baptism in all respects is the pattern for all, then why not so in these other things also, and his circumcision in infancy? Again why don't the Baptists all wait till they are thirty years of age as he did? To this they say, Scripture directs that each should be baptised as soon as he believes. That, however, shifts from and contradicts the argument on Christ's example. Conform to it throughout if sound, or reject it as inapplicable. They will do neither. We will keep them then to one or other. Was Jesus baptised immediately after *He* became a believer? Was he not one all his life? or ever an unbeliever? To meet this, after a fashion, Mr. Cameron calls the Holy Saviour's life (p. 4) "*His former life as a natural man*;" (the italicising is his own;) and repeats the same (p. 16)! His idea is to make Jesus' life before his baptism like the unregenerated condition of sinners before their conversion and baptism, that of the pure God loving and honouring, and blessed Saviour, to "*the natural man which receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God*," and "*enmity against God*" (1 Cor. 2:14; Rom. 8: 7)! "*The legs of the lame are not equal*" (Prov. 26: 7), very far from it here. Now hear the Infant baptist explanation. (Baptists keep quiet on these particulars as if they had no existence). The law of Moses required that none enter on the public ministry in the tabernacle and temple till 30 *years of age* (Numb. IV. 3, 47); and that when inducted they be consecrated by a ceremonial washing with water and anointing with oil (Exod. XL, 12, 15). "*Jesus (as Paul declares) was a minister of the circumcision*" (Rom. 15: 8; Matth. 15: 24); and to conform to that law waited before entering on his public ministry till his 30th year, as it enjoined, and was then publicly consecrated to that office, being baptised with water and anointed with "*the Spirit of God, descending like a dove and lighting upon him*." These reasons which thus fixed and controlled the period of *His* baptism are none of them binding on Christians now, not even on ministers, as we are under a different dispensation where they are not enjoined. 3. "*The Commission*" to teach and baptise all nations (Matth. 28: 19). In Mark (16: 16) it is also given, where is added (ver. 16), "*He that believeth and*

is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." They say that here is decisive proof that our Lord requires "believing" to precede "baptizing," in all cases of baptism. We answer, (1) This we admit in the case of *all* adults, but of them only. (2) That our Lord did not refer to the case of infants here, appears from the second half of the passage. Baptists believe in the salvation of infants, who are none of them capable of faith, and reconcile that belief with those words,—“he that believeth not shall be damned,” by saying that our Lord there refers only to those capable of faith. Yet wit’ striking inconsistency they will have our Lord in the first part of the same statement as contemplating the case of infants! (3) In our Lord’s statement (John iii, 5,) “Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God,” “born of water” is *before* (born) “of the Spirit.” Also in (Titus iii, 5,) “He saved us, by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost,” the “washing” is put before the “renewing.” And one part of Scripture is of as much authority as another. Baptists teach that these first expressions of those passages refer to baptism, (Carson on Baptism, p. 164). That is, baptism of water is there before faith which is radically implied and operative in the birth and renewal “of the spirit.”

On those three bases of his argument, John’s baptism; the Saviour’s by him; and the Commission; Mr. C. occupies altogether less than half a page, and does not touch nor mention one of those I have adduced, though well known. In the same method he glides over all his others. His next is “The Practice of the Apostles,” in which with ridicule in aid, he hastens over the household baptisms. The first he analyzes (by assertions) is Lydia’s; thus:

“She is described as a certain woman;—that earns her own living;—the head of the household;—is transacting business at Philippi, 300 miles from her home. From these facts where is the evidence that Lydia was married, or that she had any children, or that any of them were infants? Does not the Scriptures affirm the husband to be the head of his wife and hence of his household? but here we have a woman—supporting herself—the head of the household.”

The common Baptist reader will see no flaw in all this. Mr. C. does not give the words of Scripture, which might assist. (1.) He assumes because she was the head of the household she was unmarried, as, if married, her husband would then be the head. It does not occur to him to suggest that she could be a widow, (a not very uncommon thing,) with which also all the other things fit in exactly. (2.) He says she was “transacting business 300 miles from her home.” Where a person’s dwelling house is, one would think, is her home. Well, Luke says (Acts 16: 15), she addressed the brethren,—“If ye have judged me, to be faithful to the Lord, come into *my house* and abide there.” To make her appear as on a temporary visit to Philippi they are accustomed to refer to the words, “Lydia, a seller of purple of the city of Thyatira,” as clear proof. Well, suppose a native of London, England, residing and doing business many years in Calcutta, to have been converted under some American missionaries on a visit there, and they to report this incident to others at a distance, would they not describe him as Mr. such a one, an Englishman, or of London, England, although many years in Calcutta, a foreign country? Certainly that would not imply that he was only there on a visit. But Thyatira was in Asia, and Philippi, where Lydia now was, was in Europe, and a foreign land. Besides, *peddlars* of wares or

the like don't occupy houses of their own in the places they temporarily visit. (3.) The Scripture specifies particularly that *she* worshiped God, *she* heard Paul, the Lord opened *her* heart, *she* attended to the things spoken by Paul, and then that she was baptized and her household; while the *only* thing specified of her household is that they were baptized with her.

Let me further give you an argument of Pengilly's as a demonstrative proof that her household were believers. He says (p. 38),—

"Paul and Silas, being delivered from prison, and quitting the jailer's house and family, according to his own request, ver. 34, 36, [Acts xvi.] they 'entered into the house of Lydia,' (for my reader will remember this was the only other Christian house in the city, and in this family the only other persons baptized;) and here, undoubtedly, they would meet with her 'household' which they had baptized: having entered, we read, 'When they had seen **THE BRETHREN**, they comforted **THEM**, and departed.' If, then, Lydia's household be denominated 'brethren,' and were capable of being comforted by the Word, they must have been believers in Christ."

(The *italics* and *capitals* here are so in Pengilly).

The misrepresentation of fact here is in the last sentence beginning—

"If then Lydia's household be denominated brethren."

But they were not denominated "brethren." The words of the Scripture are, (ver. 40,) Paul and Silas "entered into the house of Lydia; and *when they had SEEN the brethren* they comforted them," etc. Pengilly reasons that Lydia and her household were the only other *Christians* in the city outside of the Jailer and his family; therefore her family *MUST* be "the brethren." He entirely keeps out of sight that Timothy and Luke were then residing with Lydia! In the last verses of the preceding chapter, (xv. 40,) we read of Paul and Silas beginning their tour. Then immediately after, Timothy joins them (xvi. 1—3). Luke (the writer of the Acts, as all admit,) is with them, for he continually uses the terms "we," and "us." These four brethren having come to Philippi (ver. 12), Lydia, after her baptism, said (ver. 15): "If ye have judged me to be faithful to the Lord, come into my house and *abide* there. And *she constrained us*." That is, they all went in, and abode with her. Only Paul and Silas were taken to prison (ver. 19, 25, 29, 40). Hence when they were set free and entered Lydia's house they would find "the brethren," Timotheus and Luke, abiding *there*, 'the only other Christian house in the city.' These brethren would be "comforted" at seeing them returned after being scourged and imprisoned, and by hearing from them of God's mercy to the Jailer's house. The other arguments Mr. Cameron adduces against infants are similarly defective and misleading, which I must pass over to admit of my looking at those on Immersion.

Second. His arguments for Immersion, p. 17, &c.

(1) His first is that the Greek word (*baptizo*) for *baptize* means always to *dip* or *immerse* (1). On this I will quote their great modern leader in the controversy, Carson, an Open Communionist, however, and much more honourable than Close Communionists. He says (On Baptism, p. 56),

"My position is that *baptizo* always signifies to dip, never expressing anything but *mode*. Now, as I have all the *lexicographers* and *commentators* against me in this opinion," &c.

By dictionaries—or "lexicons" as they are called—of other languages

we are enabled to learn and translate then. Now, would *he* make that statement, and weaken his cause, if not very true? And would all these learned men be wrong? or entirely dishonest? (2) Mr. C. insinuates, without stating it expressly, that *bapto*, the root of *baptizo*, *always* signifies to *dip*, which is untrue; and says—

"Now if this Greek verb (*baptizo*) does not mean to immerse, the Greek vocabulary does not furnish one which does."

He had just said that "*bapto* means to dip," another Greek verb. He insinuates that these two are one and the same, what every one acquainted with the Greek knows is untrue. To the unacquainted let me say, that in the Greek New Test., *bapto* is *never once* used of the ordinance of baptism; but always *baptizo*. Again, words have often meanings quite different from their root. The Greek for *spirit* is *pneuma*, yet its root meaning is *wind*, as in John 3: 8, "The wind (*pneuma*) bloweth where it listeth." "Convert" and "converse," also "conversion" and "conversation" are formed from the same root, precisely as *baptizo* is from *bapto*, but are quite different in meaning. "Craft" means *deceit* and also an honest manual trade (Acts 18: 3.) But there ARE other Greek verbs which "mean to immerse." In Liddell and Scott's Lexicon, the same that Mr. C. mentions, I find, as meanings, for instance, of *duo* and *duno*, transitively, to *plunge*; intransitively to *sink in*; to *dive*. Of *kataduo* and *kataduno*, "to make to *sink*, Latin *mergere*; intransitively, to go under, *sink*." Of *buthizo*, "to immerse, *sink*."

He (2) remarks (p. 18),

"The Greek plainly reads to *immerse*, yet our pedo-baptist friends go all over the world, saying, Oh, well it means to sprinkle!"

We don't say that *sprinkling* is the meaning of the word *baptizo* any more than dipping, as Mr. C. well knows; but that it is used of and with various modes of action, and that "the ordinance is properly administered by sprinkling, and dipping is not necessary" (Conf. Faith, p.). To *cleanse*, e. g., may be done by dipping, or, as in washing the face, by lifting up water on and rubbing, or the hands, by pouring it on or dipping them; and the *rain* cleanses things. But we don't say that to *cleanse* means "to lift up," or "pour down;" but to use the cleansing element in any way (the most convenient way is preferable) that will effect the cleansing. To *we*, scald, burn, wound, bathe, &c., &c., will similarly illustrate this. Yet though we *never* say *baptizo* means only to sprinkle, Baptists represent that we do; and, presenting some connection in the language where its mode is otherwise, say,

"Our pedo-baptist friends go all over the world, saying, Oh, well, it means to sprinkle!"

(3) He adds, that

"It is a notorious fact that the Greek Church universally immerse unto this day," and (p. 22), in Russia, "parts of which have the coldest climate in the world."

In my book, before mentioned, I give one quotation from Dr. Broadus, on Immersion (of Bapt. Public. Soc.) stating that "pouring or sprinkling are still observed in Russia" (p. 19); also a quotation in Dr. Currie's Catechism on Baptism (Methodist Book Room, Toronto, from (the Baptist) Booth's *Pedo-*

baptist Examined, of a statement of *Deylingius* in which he speaks of baptism by "*afusion* [that is, pouring or sprinkling] such as the Greeks practice at this day." Also a lengthened description from *Huber* of four Greek church baptisms he was present at, while he

"Resided upwards of three years in the capital of the Grand Seigneur's dominions in a Greek family of the first respectability."

In "*each*" case the priest

"Laid the babe on his left arm, and in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, he thrice dipped his hand in the water and dropped some of it on the child's forehead, giving it a name."

He adds that

"In the churches, before the altar, stands a tripod holding a *basin* of consecrated water for baptism."

And a *basin* is not for dipping persons in, but sprinkling from. We presume the Greek church is as good authority when differing from the Baptists as when agreeing with them.

(3) "Symbolism of baptism" (Rom. vi.) of "the death, burial and resurrection of Christ" (p. 20). It is said (ver. 4) "being buried with him by baptism into death. Also (ver. 6), "knowing this that our old man is *crucified* with him." Now what outward resemblance is there between dipping into water and *crucifixion*, or being nailed to the cross? Again, a *bodily* crucifixion or burial of *believers* is not meant, as, in that sense, *they* were not crucified or buried with him. The language is to be spiritually interpreted—"our old man,"—"that henceforth we should not serve sin;" risen with him "to walk in newness of life" [ver. 4, 6]. Rome, by literal interpretation, maintains the Saviour's words, "This is my body," and "Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life," to mean his real body and blood. However the mere words may suggest this, they don't mean it. Nor is there an outward likeness in form between bread and his body or eating it and believing in and using him; though a resemblance of a kind and in the results. Water, the element of the ordinance of baptism, is evidently appointed for it as an element of *cleansing*. Ananias said to Paul [Acts 22: 16], "Arise, and be baptized, and *wash* away thy sins." What spiritually cleanses from all sin, is the blood and Spirit of Christ; in forgiveness of the guilt and sanctification of the heart and life. In this way by faith of the Spirit's operation in and through *the Redeemer*, we become partakers of the purchased blessings of his crucifixion, death, burial, and resurrection; dead and buried to sin, delivered from its curse, love, and control, and enabled to serve God from a clean heart and right spirit. To be *cleansed* from sin, therefore, in its guilt and service is the same thing spiritually, as to be "crucified with Christ, buried and raised with him to newness of life;" and what represents; the one represents the other. This baptism does.

But again, for that matter, *sprinkling* as a *symbol*, is a suitable *sign* of *burial*. Some sprinkle earth on the coffin in *that* view. A literal burial in full extent is a covering over by any mode, as when a person is buried by the ruins of a house or an embankment falling on him; or a body laid by a side entrance in a sepulchre, or in a modern grave with earth poured down upon it. But a sign, and, in particular, a Scriptural emblem or ordinance

of that nature, is not equal in outward form to the thing signified. Thus Christ's blood which cleanses the whole man from all sin, is still called by Paul "the blood of sprinkling," (Heb. 12:24). The Lord's Supper represents a great spiritual feast of fat things, full of marrow and well refined; and the Greek word (*deipnon*) for "supper" applied to that ordinance, always means a full meal everywhere else it is used, in the New Testament, and out of it; yet in the ordinance such is forbidden (1 Cor. xi.), and only a very small portion of the bread and wine are necessary. The same spiritual blessings in fulness which it represents are also referred to by the Lord in Ezekiel (36:25),—"Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from *all* your filthiness and from *all* your idols will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you, and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh," &c. Also sprinkling upon represents the source of our blessings as from above. Moreover, some baptisms of Scripture we see to have certainly not been by dipping, while the Holy Spirit, of which it is an emblem, is described as falling upon, poured out, shed forth, descending.

In their zeal the Pharisees, who were very particular about rites and their literal renderings of Scripture, but omitted the weightier matters of truth, just "judgment, mercy and the love of God," pointed to the letter of the fourth commandment, "In it thou shalt not do any work," in justification of their hostility to Jesus and his disciples, for not keeping it as they taught. But he interpreted it differently and better. What he said on the Sabbath in defence of his disciples, is appropriate from us to the Baptists represented by Mr. C.—"If ye had known what this meaneth, I will have mercy and not sacrifice, ye would not have condemned the guiltless." Like the Sabbath, baptism was made for man, not man for baptism. Being intended for all lands and constitutions, it is suited for them in the severest climates, but dipping is not. The Baptist spirit, tactics and language in their opposition are those of a carnal cause. Ridicule of sprinkling is one of their methods. What is ridiculous about it more than dipping? Dr. Cramp, their leading historian and honoured professor, on the idea of John baptizing by sprinkling, pictures him "with a fisherman's scoop in his hand with which he dashed the water into the faces of a dozen or so at a time, some getting more, some less, [how serious a difference!] by which means it is plain, he might have operated on a great many in the course of a day. But I think you will not be willing to adopt an hypothesis so ridiculous. It would be a burlesque on a religious ordinance." (Catechism, p. 38.) If *not* looked on as a burlesque and ridiculous, we cannot thank Cramp and his brethren for it. But how boldly profane to write, print and speak in this manner of a mode of administration enjoined and observed by direct divine appointment! "Moses," we read (Heb. 9:19), "sprinkled the book and *all the people*." Was that ridiculous and a burlesque on a religious ordinance! And why should it be so in John's or our case? Was it ridiculous for the Lord to say: "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you and ye shall be clean?" and to describe the blood of Jesus as the "blood of sprinkling!"

(4) Of the day of Pentecost at Jerusalem, Mr. Cameron says (p. 21),—the twelve (apostles) could immerse the 3000 in one day. There would be only 250 candidates for each (1), giving two minutes for each candidate, the 250 could be immersed in about eight

hours." Just think of the breathless haste supposed here, to make out immersion! Here *is* scope for the sharp perception of the "ridiculous" and "burlesque on a religious ordinance," but now it is dormant as it would (truthfully) tell against the dipping theory. 250 each, to mortal man, in eight hours, one every two minutes, including the time occupied for everything between; and a solemn religious rite; so sacred that they cut off from the Lord's table, &c., even such as Spurgeon for communing with the most illustrious Christians *only* sprinkled; yet see nothing irreverent and unevangelical in such unchristian like speed! Nay, he adds 'the seventy' to 'the twelve' making "82," to baptise them, "*which*," he says, "would only give 36 to each. The whole 3000 could thus be immersed *within* 20 minutes!" (The note of admiration here is his own.) Well, 36 to each in 20 minutes is one in about *every half minute*! Words now fail us. He adds—

"I have seen many a child sprinkled, and I am satisfied the ceremony was TWICE as long as an immersion."

(The capitals and italics are made so by him.) That is, he solemnly prints "by special request," too, this assertion, by evident implication in the face of the public, that to sprinkle 3000 would take twice as long as to immerse them! We pass over the difficulty about so many changing their dress except to remark that not expecting to have been baptised when they left home in the morning they would not have brought a change with them even if there were conveniences for undressing. This defence reminds us of what we have seen in Romanists. Who say their prayers as fast as tongues can utter words, and their priests teach them so. They don't see how opposed all that is to the spirit of true religion. The Baptist theory has a similar effect in blinding when immersion is in peril, &c. Cramp [Catechism p. 40], allows 50 as baptising the 3000, who, he says—

"Would accomplish the whole *with the greatest ease and without any hurry, in less than an hour.*"

That is—less than a minute between each throughout. Surely the people who can continue to receive all this, even with pleasure and triumph, to establish immersion, are in a sad condition of mind and heart!

5. On the sufficiency of water, Mr. C. next dwells, He quotes "Dr. Robertson" (Baptist) as saying,—

"The main dependence of Jerusalem for water at the present day is on its cisterns; this has possibly always been the case," &c.;

and from "Strabo" that Jerusalem is "a rocky well enclosed fortress, *within* well watered, but *without* wholly dry." That is, well watered with artificial reservoirs, as no doubt it was. Mr. C. also refers to the pools of Bethesda, Siloam, the Fountain of the Virgin, and Gihon. Samson, in his work before quoted, admits (p. 9) that "the brook Kedron is dry several weeks before the period when the feast of Pentecost occurred," and that "the nearest living stream to Jerusalem, in which immersion could be performed, is the Jordan, distant about 15 miles." The "Pool of Siloam," he says, [p. 20] "is 53 feet long, 18 broad, and 19 deep." [Mr. C. has it 33 long, and he did not tell us its depth—19 feet! Not very handy for so many dipping one every half minute]. What is "supposed to be Bethesda," he says, is "300 feet long

130 broad, *and* 75 deep : " the sides of which are built up with masonry of small stones, whose surface is covered with a hard smooth cement." On which he thus reasons [p. 18]

" Here certainly has remained since Christ's day an expanse of water furnishing 960 baptisteries, each 6 feet by 10 ;"

in which the 3,000, he says, could have had " facilities for Christian baptism." He should have said 780, but 180 more is not material. What troubles us is the dividing and utilizing a pool of its depth, 75 feet, into baptisteries, 6 feet by 10, all over its surface ! They would need a number of boats and we don't read of any in Jerusalem or nearer than Joppa or Galilee. Even if they had them enough, it would hardly be " easy and without any hurry to immerse the 3000 in less than an hour," as Cramp assures his readers, or " within twenty minutes" as Mr. C. assured his. Mr. Cameron said, however,

" Greater than all was the royal *cistern* under the temple—a veritable lake—where hundreds could be simultaneously immersed."

Observe, the Pharisees, priests, scribes, and the mass of the people were hostile to Christ, whom they had just crucified, and to his disciples and their baptism. That day of Pentecost was a great festival attended, besides those of Jerusalem and Judea, by Jews from " every nation under heaven" [Acts 2 : 5], full of bitter anti-christian zeal. The pools and cisterns contained their water for food and religious uses. Would they allow them to be polluted by the immersion in them of thirty hundred of the hated sect of the hated Nazarene ? We read of no disturbance on that account, which of itself implies there was no immersion. Mr. C. suggests they may have been immersed in a large "*cistern* [!] *under the temple* ;" that is, from which the water was taken for the sacrifices, and while the priests, pharisees and people crowded the temple above, worshipping ! Such is the struggle to make out immersion.

Let me conclude on this with another Baptist account from a different point of view. To make out that John's mode was immersion, Pengilly reasons thus, (p. 14):

" We should notice the place where John administered this ordinance. It was ' the river Jordan.' If in reference to the people of Jerusalem, a situation where water might be easily obtained for *sprinkling* or *pouring*, was what John required, we read of our Lord at this place, directing the man that was born blind to go and ' wash in the pool of Siloam ;' so we read of the ' pool called Bethesda,' and ' the brook Cedron,' all *in or near* Jerusalem, (and we read of others in the Old Testament ;) and without doubt, at some of them the penitent Jews of that city and neighbourhood might have received the ordinance, if *such* were the mode by which John administered it ; and it cannot *reasonably* be imagined he would have *required* those persons to go the distance of several miles for the convenience of the river Jordan : more reasonable to suppose he would have baptized in every town and village where his ministry had its intended effect ; and *especially* at or near the *metropolis*. This strongly favors the opinion that immersion was his mode."

Pengilly here proceeds on the unwarranted assumption that John could have no other reason for abiding and preaching in " the wilderness," but the quantity of water for immersion. But let us suppose his facts and reasoning correct. His contention is that because, " at or near Jerusalem," *there were no conveniences for immersion*, though plenty for sprinkling, therefore John " required the penitent Jews of that city and neighbourhood to go the distance of several miles for the convenience of the river Jordan." Well, if John could not find sufficient water for immersion there, neither could the apostles. Oh, but—! That argument is sound enough in favor of immersion ; but as against immersion it must not be mentioned. Yet the Baptist Church Publication Society

constantly publishes it in Pengilly, by thousands of copies, and therefore endorses and desires its readers to believe it all sound and right in connection with John!

In indignant retort to the notion of indelicacy connected with their dipping, Mr. C. (p. 22), compares it to "Him who endured the cross, despising the SHAME," (the capitals are his). He remarks also (p. 12), of a believer who had been "sprinkled as an infant. His heart may be glowing in the freshness of his first love, he may be earnestly seeking for some self-denying act, in which he could show his allegiance to Him who died for him. *To be buried with Christ by baptism into death* would be JUST THE ACT which God would accept; but then (!) his parents *stole* a march on his faith and love, and got him sprinkled (!) while yet a babe (!)" According to this doctrine it would seem that the believer in his first love will have few opportunities of self-denial, or none, "if he was sprinkled in infancy, or at least none like *that*—like the sword of Goliath. We unevangelical unimmersed Pædo-baptists do think, and even teach, that he will find many, plenty to occupy him still more serious, and constantly recurring.

Mr. C. concludes:—

"Should it rend some fond connection,
Should I suffer pain and loss,
Yet the fragrant, blest reflection—
I have been where Jesus was—
Will revive me
When I faint beneath the Cross."

The italics are Mr. C's. The virtues flowing from immersion appear very great, or Mr. C. and his brethren are very carnal, ritualistic, deluded, and [in more senses than one], dangerous. I have shown you his and his brethren's claims to be the true church and only evangelical body in the world; and some of the like methods they take to make them good. "A careful perusal of these pages may help to open the eyes of many on this matter."

I will conclude by another extract from Bunyan's treatise against the Close-Communions, before quoted from. He begins that treatise thus:—

"Should thy lies make men hold their peace, and when thou mockest, shall no man make thee an answer;" Job xi. 2. 3.

And he says,—

"Where you are pleased to charge me with raging, for laying those eighteen particular crimes to the charge of such who exclude Christians from Church Communion," &c. "As to your saying that I proudly and imperiously insult, because I say they are babes and carnal that attempt to break the peace and communion of churches, though upon no better pretence than water; you must know I am still of that mind, and shall be so long as I see the effects that follow—viz., the breach of love, taking off Christians from the more weighty things of God, and to make them quarrel and have heartburnings one against another," &c., &c.

And the Lord says,—

That nation blessed is, whose God
JEHOVAH is, and those
A blessed people are, whom for
His heritage he chose.

For unto them that do him fear
God's mercy never ends;
And to their children's children still
His righteousness extends"

Ps. xxxiii, ciii.